UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,062	10/02/2007	Winfried Ebner	CB60766	5950
	7590 09/22/200 BEECHAM CORPOR	EXAMINER		
	INTELLECTUAL PRO	DYE, ROBERT C		
P. O. BOX 1539 KING OF PRUSSIA, PA 19406-0939			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/22/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

US_cipkop@gsk.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/591,062	EBNER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	ROBERT DYE	1791	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 September 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavireal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ').	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a compared as a final rejection, be a compared as a final rejection, be a compared as a compa	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); w); ter form for appeal by materially rec	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying th	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 ² 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	21. See attached Notice of Non-Col		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: 	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil	•	_
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	I sufficient reasons why the affidavi	it or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10.		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	,	condition for allowan	ce because:
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Joseph S. Del Sole/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791	/R. D./		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amendments to claim 1 and 5 recite new limitations with regards to the specific location of the secondary split line such that said split line is now required to intersect with the parts of the mold cavity which define the ribs and allows for air trapped by the elastomer material as it flows from transversely opposite parts of the mold cavity.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding the arguments presented, the applicant asserts that Davies teaches that the elastomer material is directed through the plastic material of the brush contrary to the applicant's invention which directs material over the surface of the pre-formed plastic part. Examiner wishes to point out that Davies further states that the elastomer can be directed by way of channels through the brush or "by visibly present channels on the brush surface". Thus, Davies does suggest inject elastomer on the brush surface.

Regarding the problem of trapped air within the mold cavity during injection filling, such is a well recognized problem in injection mold design since an injection mold cavity requires an air vent to allow resident gases to escape during mold filling. Furthermore, Steinebrunner recognizes the need to provide air venting in a toothbrush injection mold in his discussion of providing an appropriate path for hot gas to escape during injection. Although Britz is directed towards a slow, pouring mold, Britz does address the same problem of providing adequate mold ventilation by providing multiple split lines. Regarding the specific placement of the secondary split lines in relation to the intricate ribs, such is considered an introduction of new issues which require further search and consideration as noted above.